

## **REMARKS**

Applicant has requested continued examination of the present application under 37 CFR 1.114, as set forth in the accompanying request form. This request addresses the rejections of the Office Action dated July 30, 2003.

### **Rejections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6 as anticipate by the Mullaney reference, rejected claims 2 and 7 as obvious over the Mullaney and Daly et al. references, rejected claims 3 and 8 as obvious over Mullaney and Evanitsky et al., rejected claims 4 and 9 as obvious over Mullaney, Evanitsky and Frary et al., rejected claim 5 and 10 as obvious over Mullaney and Kumano, and rejected claims 11 – 15 as obvious over Mullaney and Hayama.

### **Telephone Interview**

Applicant notes with appreciation the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by the Examiner during a telephone interview in this application on December 3, 2003.

### **35 USC §102(e)**

Applicant submits that the Mullaney reference does not show the claimed invention, because the claims are directed to an invention wherein the display fields have both text and graphic elements together. Mullaney shows display fields, some of which are just text and some of which are just graphics. The Examiner agreed in the telephone interview that there is just one graphic element on each of the screens of Figures 5 – 8 in Mullaney but noted that by considering all the screens together the claims are met. Applicants submit, however, that the claims provide that the plural graphics elements are on a single screen and are shown simultaneously, whereas the Examiner is considering sequentially displayed screens as meeting the claim limitations.

Basically, Mullaney uses an all graphics screen (Figure 4) to permit selection of a language during set up, then switches to screens (Figures 5 – 8) in the selected language with

text in that language. Each of the screens of Figures 5 – 8 has a graphics element or logo displayed on the screen.

Applicant has amended the claims to further highlight the differences between the invention and the reference. The Mullaney reference therefore does not disclose the present invention as claimed.

### **35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The **Mullaney** reference is discussed above.

The **Daly** reference discloses storing information on shapes of characters and storing pixel maps which can be used to display graphic characters on a display screen in different resolutions. This does not overcome the shortcomings of Mullaney nor does it in combination therewith provide a suggestion of the claimed invention.

The **Evanitsky** reference discloses production machine such as a printer or copier with a touch sensitive screen that displays folders relating to pre-programmed tasks. Even when considered together with Mullaney, there is not teaching or suggestion of the claimed invention.

The reference to **Frary** discloses that a printer or copier has a display panel to display ASCII characters in a default language. The operating manual for the printer or copier guides the user to a menu to select another language for the display, if desired. A memory in the device stores each command in each language. No teaching of the present method is found in this reference or in the combination.

The reference to **Kumano** discloses software which permits the user to select only a portion of the text in one language and which translates that text portion and displays it in place of the selected text. This reference would not lead the person of skill in the art to develop the present invention.

The prior art references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention.



The present invention as claimed is thus not shown or suggested in the prior art, and therefore is a non-obvious improvement thereover.

### Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Melvin A. Robinson (Reg. No. 31,870)

Schiff Hardin LLP

Patent Department

6600 Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: 312-258-5785

**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

**ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT**

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on February 2, 2004.

CHI\4097387.1